FILED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEB 2 7 2018

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy Courts for the District of Columbia

Brud Rossmann,)	Codi is tot ale piediet et desemb
Plaintiff,)	
V.)))	Civil Action No. 18-126 (UNA)
Sergey Ivanov et al.,)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case because the complaint fails to meet the minimal pleading requirements of Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Pro se litigants must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Jarrell v. Tisch, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987). Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires complaints to contain "(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction [and] (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a); see Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009); Ciralsky v. CIA, 355 F.3d 661, 668-71 (D.C. Cir. 2004). The Rule 8 standard ensures that defendants receive fair notice of the claim being asserted so that they can prepare a responsive answer and an adequate defense and determine whether the doctrine of res judicata applies. Brown v. Califano, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977). "A confused and rambling narrative of charges and conclusions

... does not comply with the requirements of Rule 8." *Cheeks v. Fort Myer Constr. Corp.*, 71 F. Supp. 3d 163, 169 (D.D.C. 2014) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted).

The instant complaint consists mostly of disjointed statements that are neither short nor plain. It simply fails to provide the various defendants with adequate notice of a claim. As a result, this case will be dismissed. A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: February 17, 2018